Only one personality variable, Intolerance of Ambiguity, produced any significant main effects or interactions. In general, intolerant subjects had higher aesthetic judgment scores than tolerant subjects. These results tend to be at variance with the findings of Child (1962b, 1965). With respect to the Knowledge of Results X Intolerance of Ambiguity interactions, it seems that the tolerant person (one who scores low) thrives under true knowledge of results and is adversely influenced by false and no knowledge of results. On the whole, a highly intolerant person tends not to be influenced by the various knowledge of results conditions. Come what may, he "sticks to his guns." In some ways this finding is consonant with Child's (1965) data showing that independence of judgment is positively associated with aesthetic judgment.

The findings of this study seem to indicate that individuals characterized as being intolerant of ambiguity are more consistent and accurate judges, and that these persons tend not to revise their judgments in response to immediate reinforcement. By contrast, the highly tolerant person appears to be very sensitive to reinforcement (i.e., modifies his responses according to the immediate reinforcements). Given these results, one might be mildly curious about the personality traits of those final arbiters of aesthetic judgment, the art critics.

References

Budner, S. Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. Journal of Personality, 1963, 30, 29-50.

Child, I. L. A study of aesthetic judgment. Mimeographed report, Yale University, 1962 (U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 669). (a)

Child, I. L. Personal preferences as an expression of esthetic sensitivity. Journal of Personality, 1962, 30, 496-512. (b)

Child, I. L. Development of sensitivity to esthetic values. Mimeographed report, Yale University, 1964 (U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1748).

Child, I. L. Personality correlates of aesthetic judgment in college students. Journal of Personality, 1965, 33, 476-511.

Mandler, G. and Sarason, S. B. A study of anxiety and learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 166-173.

Meier, N. C. The Meier Art Tests. Bureau of Educational Research and Service, University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1940.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80, Whole No. 609.

TABLE 1

Mean Number of Items Correct on Treatment 25 Items
(Intolerance of Ambiguity x Knowledge of Results)[a]

Intolerance of Ambiguity	Knowledge of Results					
	True		No		False	
Low	20.25	(8)	15.71	(7)	16.89	(9)
Medium	22.11	(9)	19.40	(10)	16.80	(5)
High	19.43	(7)	22.00	(7)	18.00	(10)

[a]Cell sizes are in parentheses.

TABLE 2

Mean Number of Items Correct on Follow-up 25 Items
(Intolerance of Ambiguity x Knowledge of Results)[a]

Intolerance of Ambiguity	Knowledge of Results					
	True		No		False	
Low	21.50	(8)	18.43	(7)	17.22	(9)
Medium	20.22	(9)	19.60	(10)	18.20	(5)
High	21.00	(7)	20.29	(7)	20.30	(10)

[a]Cell sizes are in parentheses.

jeh